



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,171	12/29/2005	Peter Le Lievre	P 1147.15006	3743
74310	7590	04/27/2009	EXAMINER	
Portland Intellectual Property, LLC			BASICHAS, ALFRED	
900 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 1820				
Portland, OR 97204			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3743	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/563,171	LE LIEVRE, PETER	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alfred Basicas	3743	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 18-33 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 18-33 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :12/29/05,9/10/07,2/7/08,6/20/08.

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 18-33 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16-30 of copending Application No. 10/563,170. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they recite the same general invention.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 18-22, 24, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sick (4,820,033), which shows all of the claimed limitations. For example:

18. A carrier structure for a reflector element, for use in a solar energy reflector system, and which comprises: a platform 11 which is arranged to carry the reflector element 15 and which is formed with stiffening elements 12,24; a frame structure 26,32 supporting the platform; and mounting means 29,30 supporting the frame structure in a manner that accommodates turning of the carrier structure about an axis of rotation that lies substantially coincident with a longitudinal axis of the reflector element when mounted to the platform (see at least figs. 1-3).

19. The carrier structure as claimed in claim 18 wherein the platform comprises a corrugated metal panel 15, with the corrugations forming the stiffening elements, and wherein the reflector element is supported upon the crests of the corrugations (see at least figs. 1-3).

20. The carrier structure as claimed in claim 18 wherein the platform comprises a panel-like platform, wherein the stiffening elements are formed as flutes in the platform and wherein the reflector element is supported upon crests of the flutes (see at least figs. 1-3).

21. The carrier structure as claimed in claim 19 wherein the stiffening elements are orientated to extend in a direction parallel to the axis of rotation (see at least figs. 1-3).

22. The carrier structure as claimed in claim 18 wherein the platform is curved concavely in a direction orthogonal to the axis of rotation (see at least figs. 1-3).

24. The carrier structure as claimed in claim 22 wherein the reflector element is secured to the platform in a manner such that the curvature of the platform is imparted to the reflector element (see at least figs. 1-3).

27. The carrier structure as claimed in claim 24 wherein the reflector element is adhered to the platform (see at least claim 5).

28. The carrier structure as claimed in claim 18 wherein the frame structure comprises hoop-like end members 26 that extend about the axis of rotation of the carrier structure and wherein the platform extends in the longitudinal direction between the end members (see at least figs. 1-3).

29. The carrier structure as claimed in claim 28 wherein the end members are supported for turning upon the mounting means 29, 30.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 3743

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sick (4,820,033) in view of Butler (4,559,926). Sick discloses substantially all of the claimed limitations. While Sick discloses a transmission of motion from the electric motor acting on the periphery of the circular ring 26, Sick does not specifically recite imparting drive by one of the end members. Butler teaches a solar collector drive arrangement including hoop element 18, with surrounding fixed chain 30, end members 20, and motor 22 driving the hoop element via the end member (see at least figs. 2,3). Butler teaches that such an arrangement provides a low cost drive system (see at least col. 1, lines 45-48). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the drive details taught by Butler into the invention disclosed by Sick, so as to provide a low cost drive system.

8. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sick (4,820,033), which discloses substantially all of the claimed limitations. While Sick inherently includes a radius of curvature to enhance the concentration of sun light, Sick does not specifically recite the claimed range. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the claimed range into the invention disclosed by Sick, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable values or ranges involves only routine skill in the

art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233; *In re Swain*, 156 F.2d 239. See also Peterson, 315 F.3d at 1330, 65 USPQ2d at 1382 (“The normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known provides the motivation to determine where in a disclosed set of percentage ranges is the optimum combination of percentages.”).

9. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sick (4,820,033), which discloses substantially all of the claimed limitations. While Sick discloses metal mirrors, Sick does not specifically recite the use of glass mirrors. Official Notice is given that the use of glass mirrors in solar concentrators is old and well known in the art. Such an arrangement has the clear and obvious benefit of providing for efficient reflection and concentration of sunlight. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate glass mirrors into the invention disclosed by Sick, so as to provide for efficient reflection and concentration of sunlight.

10. Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sick (4,820,033) in view of Funger (6,543,441). Sick discloses substantially all of the claimed limitations, but does not specifically recite the claimed channel/roller arrangement. Funger teaches a solar collector including a channel/roller arrangement (see at least fig. 12). Such an arrangement clearly provides for effective load bearing and weight distribution. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the channel/roller as taught

by Funger into the invention disclosed by Sick, so as to provide effective load bearing and weight distribution.

Prior Art

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. This reference discloses a solar reflector system with many of the claimed components. Nevertheless, in order to avoid overburdening the applicant with redundant rejections, this reference was not applied.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alfred Basichas whose telephone number is 571 272 4871. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday during regular business hours.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Tech Center telephone number is 571 272 3700.

April 24, 2009

/Alfred Basichas/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3743